



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,278	03/25/2004	Naoki Yamane	968.3/174	6036
27879 7590 04/07/2008 INDIANAPOLIS OFFICE: 27879 BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2033				
EXAMINER				
ADDY, ANTHONY S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/07/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentofficeactions@brinkshofer.com

svessely@usebrinks.com

dhasler@usebrinks.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,278

Applicant(s)

YAMANE ET AL.

Examiner

ANTHONY S. ADDY

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CD/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on September 10, 2007. **Claims 15-42** has been cancelled and new **claims 43-67** has been added. **Claims 43-67** are now pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 43-67** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Arguments are directed to newly added limitations and the new ground(s) of rejection based on the newly added limitations follow below.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features of "determining whether said email message is first type of email message or a second type of email message; executing a first application operable on said communication terminal to read only said first type of email message; and executing a second application operable on said communication terminal to read at least said second type of email message," must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended

replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claim 59** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 59, applicant recites the limitation "said processor" on line 1 of claim 59; however there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
7. Claims 43-50, 52-63 and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Shiigi, U.S. Publication Number 2002/0046249 A1 (hereinafter Shiigi)** and further in view of **Kelley, U.S. Patent Number 7,328,244 (hereinafter Kelley)**.

Regarding claim 43, Shiigi teaches a method of executing at least two applications (*e.g. Handwriting Messaging Client 211, Java VM 212, & Web Browser 213 which supports an email client, such as Microsoft Outlook, Pegasus Mil, Eudora mail, or Lotus Notes*) with a communication terminal (*e.g. client computer 210*), the method comprising: receiving an email message that includes an email address of a sender and an intended recipient from an email server (*e.g. server computer 220*) (see p. 3 [0032] and Fig. 2A), wherein there are two types of email messages (see p. 4 [0043-0044] and p. 5 [0061, 0064 & 0081]); executing a first application operable on said communication terminal to read only said first type of email message (see p. 3 [0027 & 0032], p. 4 [0049] and p. 5 [0081]); and executing a second application operable on said communication terminal to read at least said second type of email message (see p. 3 [0027 & 0032], p. 4 [0049] and p. 5 [0081]).

Shiigi fails to explicitly teach determining whether said email message is a first type of email message or a second type of email message;

In an analogous field of endeavor, Kelley teaches a client computer is configured to determine whether a received email message is a first type of email message or a second type of email message that is different from said first type of email message (see col. 5, lines 41-48 and col. 6, lines 40-53).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shiigi with the teachings of Kelley to include a communication terminal, comprising: said control unit further configured to determine whether said email message is a first type of email message or a second type of email message that is different from said first type of email message, in order to classify electronic mail received at a client computer to provide an increased user efficiency and friendliness since a recipient of numerous e-mail messages will not have to search through each e-mail message when looking for a particular message, but would instead look directly in the electronic storage site in the desired e-mail category to which the e-mail message pertains.

Regarding claim 44, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 43. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, wherein determining whether said email message is a first type of email message or a second type of email message further comprises determining from an identifier included in said email message if said email message is compatible with said first application or said second application (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 5, lines 41-48 and col. 6, lines 40-62).

Regarding claim 45, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 44. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, further comprising storing said email

message and data related to receipt of said email message in a predetermined reception box folder associated with said first application when said email message is determined to be compatible with said first application; and storing said email message and data related to receipt of said email message in a folder designated within said email message and associated with said second application when said email message is determined to be compatible with said second application (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 5, lines 41-48 and col. 6, lines 40-62).

Regarding claim 46, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 44. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, wherein determining from an identifier included in said email message if said email message is compatible comprises the step of reading an identifier included in a header of said email message to determine if said first application or said second application is indicated (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 16-22 & 40-62).

Regarding claim 47, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 46. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, wherein storing said email message and data related to receipt of said email message in a folder designated within said email message comprises the steps of checking a table stored in said communication terminal for said identifier and a corresponding folder name, and storing said data related to said email message in said folder that is associated with said identifier and is accessible by execution of said second application (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 16-22 & 40-62).

Regarding claim 48, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 47. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, further comprising the step of executing said second application to access said folder based on said identifier and to display a listing that includes an email title, an email reception date, and an email reception time of said email message that is retrieved from said folder (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 16-22 & 40-62).

Regarding claim 49, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 48. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, further comprising the steps of said second application obtaining a message identification associated with said listing, and extracting said email message from a stored location for display based on said message identification (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027 & 0032] and p. 6 [0086] and *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 16-22 & 40-62).

Regarding claim 50, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 45. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, further comprising the step of said second application instructing said first application to generate said folder and a folder table, said second application executable to display data associated with said email message stored in said folder as a function of said folder table (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0032] and p. 6 [0086] and *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 25-53).

Regarding claim 52, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 43. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a method, wherein said email message includes an identifier that comprises a character identifier designated by a sender of said email message, and the method further comprises said second application executable to

display an animation of a character indicated with said character identifier followed sequentially by display of a content of said email message (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027 & 0032]).

Regarding claim 53, Shiigi teaches a communication terminal (e.g. *client computer 210*) operational with at least two applications (e.g. *Handwriting Messaging Client 211 & Java VM 212, & Web Browser 213 which supports an email client, such as Microsoft Outlook, Pegasus Mil, Eudora mail, or Lotus Notes*), each of said at least two applications operable to provide a user interface (see p. 3 [0027 & 0032] and Fig. 1B), the communication terminal comprising: a control unit operable in a communication terminal (i.e. *a client computer 210 such as digital cell phones and personal digital assistants (PDAs) inherently include a control unit to control the functions of the computer device*) and configured to receive an email message from an email server (e.g. *server computer 220*) that includes an email address of a sender and an intended recipient (see p. 3 [0032] and Fig. 1B), wherein there are two types of email messages (see p. 4 [0043-0044] and p. 5 [0061, 0064 & 0081]); said control unit further configured to execute a first application operable on said communication terminal to read only said first type of email message (see p. 3 [0027 & 0032], p. 4 [0049] and p. 5 [0081]); and said control unit further configured to execute a second application operable on said communication terminal to read at least said second type of email message (see p. 3 [0027 & 0032], p. 4 [0049] and p. 5 [0081]).

Shiigi fails to explicitly teach said control unit further configured to determine whether said email message is a first type of email message or a second type of email message that is different from said first type of email message.

In an analogous field of endeavor, Kelley teaches a client computer is configured to determine whether a received email message is a first type of email message or a second type of email message that is different from said first type of email message (see col. 5, lines 41-48 and col. 6, lines 40-53).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shiigi with the teachings of Kelley to include a communication terminal, comprising: said control unit further configured to determine whether said email message is a first type of email message or a second type of email message that is different from said first type of email message, in order to classify electronic mail received at a client computer to provide an increased user efficiency and friendliness since a recipient of numerous e-mail messages will not have to search through each e-mail message when looking for a particular message, but would instead look directly in the electronic storage site in the desired e-mail category to which the e-mail message pertains.

Regarding claim 54, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 53. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said first application is executable to generate or open email messages (see p. 3 [0027]).

Regarding claim 55, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 54. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said second

application is downloadable to said mobile communication terminal, said second application also operable in said communication terminal to generate or open email messages (see p. 3 [0027 & 0034]).

Regarding claim 56, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 55. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein only said first application is executable to communicate with said email server to transmit and receive email messages (see p. 3 [0027 & 0032]).

Regarding claim 57, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 56. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said email message is a first email message, and said second application is executable to enable said first application to transmit a second email message, to a designated recipient, that is generated for transmission with only said second application, to include a header and an email address of a designated recipient of said second email message (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027 & 0032] and *Kelley*, col. 5, lines 41-48 and col. 6, lines 40-62)..

Regarding claim 58, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 57. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said second application is further executable to store said second email message generated for transmission in association with a transmission folder that is accessible with said first application, wherein said first email application is further executable to transmit for receipt by said email server email messages associated with said transmission folder (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 54-62).

Regarding claim 59, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 53. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said processor is further configured to determine if said received email message is compatible with said first application or said second application (see p. 3 [0027 & 0032], p. 4 [0049] and p. 5 [0081]).

Regarding claim 60, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 53. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said first type of email message is storable in association with a predetermined reception folder that is associated with said first application, and said second type of email message is storable in association with a folder identified with said email message, wherein said second type of email message is storable in association with said second application (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 5, lines 41-48 and col. 6, lines 40-62).

Regarding claim 61, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 53. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said second type of email message includes an identifier that is not included in said first type of email message (see *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 25-62).

Regarding claim 62, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 61. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said identifier comprises at least one of a character mail identifier or a character identifier (see *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 25-62).

Regarding claim 63, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 53. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said email

message is a first email message, said control unit further configured to store, in a specified storage area, a second email message generated with said second application for transmission, and to execute said first application to transmit said second email message, said second email message generated with said second application to include indication of a destination email address (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027] and *Kelley*, col. 5, lines 41-48 and col. 6, lines 40-62).

Regarding claim 66, *Shiigi* in view of *Kelley* teaches all the limitations of claim 53. *Shiigi* in view of *Kelley* further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said first application is executable with said control unit to communicate with said email server; and said second application is not executable with said control unit to communicate with said email server (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027]).

Regarding claim 67, *Shiigi* in view of *Kelley* teaches all the limitations of claim 53. *Shiigi* in view of *Kelley* further teaches a communication terminal, wherein said first application and said second application are each configured to provide a user with a respective user interface to independently read and generate email messages that include an email address indicating a destination, an email title, and a body of text (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0027]).

8. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Shiigi, U.S. Publication Number 2002/0046249 A1 (hereinafter Shiigi)** and **Kelley, U.S. Patent Number 7,328,244 (hereinafter Kelley)** as applied to claim 43 above, and

further in view of **Shiraishi et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,809,724 (hereinafter Shiraishi)**.

Regarding claim 51, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 43. Shiigi in view of Kelley fails to explicitly teach a method, further comprising generating a first email arrival indication to a user in response to said email message being determined to be said first type of email message, and generating a second email arrival indication to said user that is different than said first email arrival indication in response to said email message being determined to be said second type of email message.

In an analogous field of endeavor, Shiraishi teaches a display apparatus and a portable information processing apparatus incorporating the display apparatus, wherein a first email arrival indication is generated to a user in response to said email message being determined to be said first type of email message, and generating a second email arrival indication to said user that is different than said first email arrival indication in response to said email message being determined to be said second type of email message (see col. 28, lines 48-60). Shiraishi further teaches the notification of arrival of an electronic mail may be conducted not only by means of voice but also by using any of other types of sign such as tone, vibration, smell, light, electrical shock, and so forth (see col. 45, lines 46-56).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shiigi and Kelley with the teachings of Shiraishi to include a method, further comprising generating a first email arrival indication to a user in

Art Unit: 2617

response to said email message being determined to be said first type of email message, and generating a second email arrival indication to said user that is different than said first email arrival indication in response to said email message being determined to be said second type of email message, in order to alert a user about an arrival of an email with a high and low degree of urgency using a first type of icon to a mail with a high degree of urgency and a second type of icon that is different than the first type of icon to a mail which has a low degree of urgency as taught by Shiraishi (see col. 28, lines 48-52).

9. Claim 64 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Shiigi, U.S. Publication Number 2002/0046249 A1 (hereinafter Shiigi)** and **Kelley, U.S. Patent Number 7,328,244 (hereinafter Kelley)** as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of **Ueno et al., U.S. Publication Number 2002/0016823 A1 (hereinafter Ueno)**.

Regarding claim 64, Shiigi in view of Kelley teaches all the limitations of claim 63. Shiigi in view of Kelley further teaches a communication terminal, further comprising a storage in communication with said control unit and an identifier of said second application is stored in said storage in accordance with said first email message and said second email message (see *Shiigi*, p. 4 [0054] and p. 6 [0086]), but fails to explicitly teach wherein said storage is a removable storage unit detachably coupled with said communication terminal.

In an analogous field of endeavor, Ueno teaches a communication terminal, further comprising storage in communication with said control unit, wherein said storage is a removable storage unit detachably coupled with said communication terminal for storing e-mail or simple format website contents (see p. 6 [0079] and Fig. 2).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shiigi and Kelley with the device of Ueno, to include a communication terminal, further comprising a storage in communication with said control unit, wherein said storage is a removable storage unit detachably coupled with said communication terminal, in order to allow a user to easily remove and share stored data with other electronic devices by way of the inserted removable memory as taught by Ueno (see p. 6 [0082]).

Regarding claim 65, the combination of Shiigi, Kelley and Ueno teaches all the limitations of claim 64. The combination of Shiigi, Kelley and Ueno further teaches a communication terminal, wherein the second email message generated, with the second application that is stored in the specified storage area is stored in the storage in a transmission box folder, and the first application is executable with the control unit to check for the second email message stored in the transmission box folder, and read out the second email message stored therein for transmission to the email server (see *Shiigi*, p. 3 [0032] and p. 6 [0086] and *Kelley*, col. 6, lines 40-53).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fung et al., U.S. Patent Number 7,237,009 discloses methods, systems and data structures for assigning categories to electronic mail.

Moon et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,088,696 discloses mailing/filing system for congruently categorizing different types of electronic mail resources received through a messaging system.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2617

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY S. ADDY whose telephone number is (571)272-7795. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc M. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Anthony S Addy/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Duc Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617